

1 AARON D. FORD
2 Attorney General
3 DENNIS W. HOUGH, Bar No. 11995
4 Deputy Attorney General
5 State of Nevada
6 Public Safety Division
7 100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701-4717
Tel: (775) 684-1254
E-mail: drough@ag.nv.gov

8
9 *Attorneys for Defendants*
James Dzurenda, Renee Baker,
William Gittere, and William Reubart

10

FILED	RECEIVED
ENTERED	SERVED ON
COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RECORD	
JUL 11 2019	
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT	
DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
BY:	DEPUTY

11

12 ARTHUR JULIUS-GREEN BERAH
aka TRAVERS A. GREEN,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,

16 Defendants.

17 *ORDER*

18 Case No. 3:17-cv-00366-RCJ-CBC

19 **MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S
INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

20 Defendants, James Dzurenda, Renee Baker, William Gittere, and William Reubart, by and
through Counsel Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and Dennis W. Hough,
Deputy Attorney General, hereby moves this Honorable Court for an enlargement of time to respond to
Plaintiff's Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents.

21 This Motion is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities and the papers
and pleadings on file herein.

22 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

23 **I. FACTS AND RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

24 Plaintiff Arthur Julius-Greene Beraha, (hereinafter Beraha), filed his First Amended Complaint
on January 11, 2018 (ECF No. 10). The Court issued a Screening Order on June 15, 2018 (ECF No. 12).
On July 25, 2018, Plaintiff Beraha filed a Motion to Defer Early Inmate Mediation Program. The Court
granted Beraha's request in a Minute Order filed August 30, 2018 (ECF No. 23), and excluded the case

1 from the inmate mediation program, because of Count III alleging improper trade practices on the part
2 of IC Solutions, et al, which provides inmate calling services.

3 Since that time a Judgment was filed in favor of Century Link, IC Solutions (ECF No. 85). A
4 Scheduling Order was completed on June 3, 2019, (ECF No. 87), and Discovery has proceeded.
5 Defendants request a thirty (30) day Extension of Time to complete Answers to Interrogatories, and
6 Production of Documents. Counsel for Defendants has had a number of competing demands, and has
7 some difficulty getting financial information Plaintiff has requested from its Client. The requested
8 Extension of Time will not unduly prejudice the Plaintiff, and will result in Plaintiff obtaining the
9 information he requests.

10 **II. DISCUSSION**

11 **A. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1) allows this Court to extend deadlines.**

12 District courts have inherent power to control their dockets. *Hamilton Copper & Steel Corp. v.*
13 *Primary Steel, Inc.*, 898 F.2d 1428, 1429 (9th Cir. 1990); *Oliva v. Sullivan*, 958 F.2d 272, 273 (9th Cir.
14 1992). Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1) governs enlargements of time and provides as follows:

15 When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may,
16 for good cause, extend the time: (A) with or without motion or notice if
the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its
extension expires; or (B) on motion made after the time has expired if the
17 party failed to act because of excusable neglect.

18 “The proper procedure, when additional time for any purpose is needed, is to present to the
19 Court a timely request for an extension before the time fixed has expired (*i.e.*, a request presented
20 before the time then fixed for the purpose in question has expired).” *Canup v. Miss. Valley Barge Line*
21 *Co.*, 31 F.R.D. 282, 283 (D.Pa. 1962). The *Canup* Court explained that “the practicalities of life” (such
22 as an attorney’s “conflicting professional engagements” or personal commitments such as vacations,
23 family activities, illnesses, or death) often necessitate an enlargement of time to comply with a court
24 deadline. *Id.* Extensions of time “usually are granted upon a showing of good cause, if timely made.”
25 *Creedon v. Taubman*, 8 F.R.D. 268, 269 (D.Ohio 1947). The good cause standard considers a party’s
26 diligence in seeking the continuance or extension. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d
27 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992).

28 ///

III. CONCLUSION

Defendants' counsel requires additional time to complete the Response to Interrogatories, and the Production of Documents, Defendants respectfully request that this Honorable Court grant their motion and extend the due date for Interrogatories and Production of Documents by thirty (30) days.

DATED this 10th day of July, 2019.

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

By:

DENNIS W. HOUGH, Bar No. 11995
Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Defendants

IT IS SO ORDERED

U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: 7/11/2019

DATED: 7/11/2019